

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated May 4, 2005. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

The first page of the specification has been amended to update the co-pending applications and cross-references with USPTO application numbers.

The claims have been amended to correct the typographical errors and claims construction errors identified by the Examiner. Applicant thanks the Examiner for highlighting these issues.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claims 19 and 21 (now cancelled). Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that it defines a device that houses a flat panel display and pagewidth inkjet printhead within an outer casing as opposed to a display and a printer as separate components of a greater system or apparatus.

It is submitted that the amendments do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 1, 15, 19, 25, 26 and 27

Claims 1, 15, 19, 25, 26 and 27 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of the disclosure in JP 08267854 A to Kashiwa et al.

Amended claim 1 has incorporated the features of cancelled claims 19 and 21 – namely that the printhead is a pagewidth inkjet printhead. It has also been amended to clarify that it defines a single device with the display and printer housed in an outer casing. As discussed in the Detailed Description (see page 23, line 31 to page 24, line 8), the flat panel display and pagewidth inkjet printhead combination of amended claim 1 has compact dimensions to use a minimum of desk space. The print quality of an inkjet system and low vibration of a

pagewidth (non-scanning) printhead provides a stable display that produces high speed, high resolution prints directly in front on the user.

Kashiwa describes a laptop computer that incorporates a printer. Accordingly, the screen and the printer are separate components of a larger overall device. There is no disclosure of a flat panel display and pagewidth inkjet printhead within a single housing such that it forms a separate stand alone device with a relatively small footprint on the users desktop.

In light of the above, Kashiwa fails to anticipate the printing and display device defined by amended claim 1. As claims 15, 25, 26 and 27 are directly or indirectly appended to amended claim 1, they are also novel in light of the Kashiwa disclosure.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 8, 10, 23, 32 and 37

Claims 8, 10, 23, 32 and 37 stand rejected as obvious in light of the disclosure in JP 08267854 A to Kashiwa et al in view of US 5,558,449 to Morgavi.

Claims 8, 10, 23, 32 and 37 are directly or indirectly appended to amended claim 1. As discussed above, Kashiwa fails to teach the combination of features defined by amended claim 1. The duplexed thermal printheads of Morgavi, when combined with the Kashiwa disclosure still fail to disclose a flat panel display and pagewidth inkjet printhead housed in an outer casing. It follows that claims 8, 10, 23, 32 and 37 are not obvious in light of the cited references.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 1-7, 9, 11-22, 24, 27-31, 33-36 and 38

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-22, 24, 27-31, 33-36 and 38 stand rejected as obvious in light of the disclosure in US 5,752,049 to Lee in view of US 6,188,569 to Minemoto et al.

Lee is similar to Kashiwa in that it incorporates a printer into a computer. However, Lee also fails to disclose a flat panel display and a pagewidth inkjet printhead. The pagewidth printhead shown in Figure 2 of Lee is a laser printer with photosensitive drum 200, charging device 202, a developer 208, transfer device 210, cleaner 212, register roller 218 and fixing device 220 (see col. 4, lines 39-42). This assembly of components is a bulky design that

would not allow the compact dimensions of the present invention. Accordingly, the Lee computer/printer combination occupies a much larger footprint on the user's desk than the present invention.

Lee briefly mentions an inkjet printhead as one of several possible alternatives for the printer. However, it fails to contemplate a pagewidth inkjet printhead, or the compact design of a pagewidth inkjet printhead and flat panel display combination as a stand alone device.

Similarly, Minemoto fails to teach or suggest the combination of pagewidth inkjet printhead and flat panel display. Minemoto incorporates a computer processor and LCD screen into a single device but fails to recognize that a stand alone a flat panel display and pagewidth inkjet printhead meets the majority of user interface requirements. With the processor remote from the screen and printer, a minimum of desk space is used.

Neither of the cited references consider the possibility of placing the processor remote from the screen. In fact, they are primarily directed to combining the processor and screen. The ordinary worker would have no motivation to combine Lee and Minemoto to derive a flat panel display and pagewidth inkjet printhead stand alone device.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is clearly not obvious in light of Lee in view of Minemoto and therefore claims 2-7, 9, 11-22, 24, 27-31, 33-36 and 38 are similarly not obvious by virtue of their appendance to amended claim 1.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762